

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 11/06/2002

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/502,729	02/11/2000	Stephan Alan Cohen	YO999-573	5596
759	90 11/06/2002			
Rocco S Barrese Esq Dilworth & Barrese 333 Earle Ovington Boulevard			EXAMINER	
			LOUIE, WAI SING	
Uniondale, NY 11553			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2814	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
•	ę	09/502,729	COHEN ET AL.	,
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Wai-Sing Louie	2814	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication a	appears on the cover sheet	vith the correspondence address -	•
Period for		NAME OF THE EVELOP A	ACNITIVO EDOM	
THE M - Extens after S - If the p - If NO p - Failure - Any rep earned	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF AILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION ions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR IX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re- period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stated ply received by the Office later than three months after the may patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	V. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of the od will apply and will expire SIX (6) Mo tute, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed  irty (30) days will be considered timely.  ONTHS from the mailing date of this communical ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ition.
Status	December 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1	18 August 2002		
1) 🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2			
2a)⊠		This action is non-final.	attors, prospection as to the merit	te ie
3) L	Since this application is in condition for allocations of claims	er Ex parte Quayle, 1935 (	2.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	13 13
•	Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are pending in the applicat	tion.		
•	a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without			
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
	Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are rejected.			
, —	Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
_	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.		
Application				
9) <u></u> ⊤	he specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.		
10) 🗌 T	he drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) _ ad			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to			
11) 🔲 T	he proposed drawing correction filed on		disapproved by the Examiner.	
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in			
12) 🔲 T	he oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner.		
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
13) 🔲	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	eign priority under 35 U.S.C	c. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)[	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:			
	<ol> <li>Certified copies of the priority docum</li> </ol>			
	2. Certified copies of the priority docum			
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the paper application from the International ee the attached detailed Office action for a	Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)	).	
	cknowledgment is made of a claim for dome			cation).
	☐ The translation of the foreign language			
	cknowledgment is made of a claim for dom			
Attachment	(s)			
2) Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No	5) Notice	ew Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	<u> </u>



Art Unit: 2814

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. (US 2002/0020919) in view of Ibok (US 6,235,456).

With regard to claim 1, Li et al. disclose a diffusion barrier layer ([0020] to [0029] and fig. 2) for semiconductor devices having an upper surface and a lower surface and a central portion and comprising silicon, carbon, nitrogen, and hydrogen ([0024]). Li et al. teach the conductive material 32 should be surrounded by nitride to prevent diffusion of Cu into insulative material 40 and oxygen into Cu layer 32 ([0012] and fig. 2), but Li et al. do not disclose the nitrogen being non-uniformly distributed throughout the diffusion barrier layer 100. However, Ibok discloses a graded silicon oxynitride layer 108, which the ratio of silicon and nitrogen varies through the layer. The nitrogen is selective deposited in the layer, which changes through out the top, bottom, or central portion of the layer (Ibok col. 5, line 64 to col. 6, line 8). Ibok teaches the graded nitrogen region is for the application of high mechanical strength, polish stop layer, and/or high resistance to diffusion of contaminant molecules (Ibok col. 2, lines 50-54). Ibok also teaches the graded nitrogen layer formed by CVD can be integrated easily in the manufacturing processes with minimal disruption (Ibok col. 6, lines 15-18). Therefore, it would

Art Unit: 2814

have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include a non-uniformly distributed barrier layer with a central portion is substantially devoid of nitrogen in Li's device in order to have the diffusion barrier to prevent the diffusion of Cu and have high mechanical strength.

With regard to claims 2-3 and 8-9, Light et al. modified by Ibok would have the upper and lower surface of the diffusion barrier layer, which is relatively thin compared to the central portion of the diffusion barrier layer (Ibok col. 6, lines 9-12).

With regard to claim 4-6 and 10, please see the description of record.

Claims 7 and 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ngo et al. (US 6,228,761) in view of Li et al. (US 2002/0020919) and Ibok (US 6,235,456).

With regard to claim 7, Ngo et al. disclose a semiconductor device (col. 4, line 35 to col. 6, line 48 and fig. 10) comprising:

- A substrate 40 containing conductive elements;
- A diffusion barrier layer 56 applied to at least a portion of the substrate in contact with the conductive metal 58. Ngo et al. do not disclose the diffusion barrier layer 56 having an upper and a lower surfaces and a central portion comprising silicon, carbon, nitrogen, and hydrogen with nitrogen being non-uniformly distributed throughout the diffusion barrier layer 56. However, Li et al. modified by Ibok, in claim 1 above, disclose the above-mentioned layers. Li et al. teach the silicon chemically bonded oxynitride and organic material would provide a barrier between the conductive metal and insulative material to prevent the diffusion of elements (Li [0021] and [0025]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one

Art Unit: 2814

with ordinary skill in the art to provide the diffusion barrier layer having an upper and a lower surfaces and a central portion devoid of nitrogen. Doing so would prevent the diffusion of elements and damage the device.

With regard to claim 11-16, please see the description of record.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 8/28/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- Reference Park (US 6,100,559) is no longer used as a secondary reference. The argument is moot.
- Applicant argues reference Ngo et al. do not disclose a diffusion barrier layer
  having an upper, lower, and a central portion. However, Ngo et al. modified by
  Light et al. and Ibok would meet all claimed limitations of claim 7.

### Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

Art Unit: 2814

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

Page 5

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wai-Sing Louie whose telephone number is (703) 305-0474. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael Fahmy can be reached on (703) 308-4918. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

LONG PHAM PRIMARY EXAMINE :

November 1, 2002